

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 17, and 21 are the independent claims. In the Official Action dated September 13, 2006, the drawings were accepted, and various rejections under 35 USC § 112 and 35 USC § 101 were withdrawn. Applicants thank the Examiner for his prompt action in this regard.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 20-24, 26-28, and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US PGPub 2005/00500000 (Kwok). Claims 5, 7-19, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Kwok. Claims 9, 15, and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Kwok in view of US Pat. 6, 799,299 (Li).

Please amend the claims as set forth above.

Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for participating in two telephonic interviews to discuss this application. Applicants' representative, Nathaniel Ari Long, and Examiner Faber first discussed this application on Oct. 17, 2006. At this interview, the claims then pending along with certain amendments were discussed in view of Kwok. No agreement was reached as to whether the amendments would overcome Kwok. Applicants' representative agreed to reconsider the Kwok and the other references of record. Applicants' representative and the Examiner agreed to reconsider the various issues raised and discuss once more by telephone.

At the second interview, on Nov. 9 2006, the same individuals discussed draft claim amendments similar to the amendments submitted above. Applicant's representative explained aspects of the various amendments that in his view overcome Kwok. In particular, Kwok does not contain an input file as outlined in the amendments above, nor does Kwok utilize two automated processes that share responsibility in generating an XSLT transform according to the particular approach required by the claims. The Examiner stated that the amendments may overcome Kwok, and that a new search would be necessary to make a determination regarding the amended claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-10 Under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, for containing subject matter not described in the specification. Specifically, the term “inherit” or “inheritance” was considered improper because that term was not found in the specification. Applicants point to page 22, Appendix B, example 1, in which the specification states:

This transform includes/inherits a base transform. The base transform provides basic logic to transform the declarative input file into a transform that can be used to transform instance documents. That basic logic is included and overridden to provide the exact logic required.

A similar statement can also be found on page 24 in example 2. In light of this support in the specification, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 20-24, 26-28, and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US PGPub 2005/00500000 (Kwok). Claims 5, 7-19, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Kwok. Claims 9, 15, and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Kwok in view of US Pat. 6, 799,299 (Li).

Claims 3-5, 7, 9 and 11-30 are canceled. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 8 are amended, and new claims 31-36 are submitted. Applicants submit that the claims as amended are not disclosed in Kwok, Li, or the other references of record. In particular, Kwok does not disclose:

producing an input file comprising:

an identification of a mapping relationship between at least one data pattern from an XML source file and at least one data pattern for a new file;

at least one pre-designed custom XSLT transform; and

at least one namespace manager comprising a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) and namespace prefix pair;

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2954/307197.01
Application No.: 10/805,045
Office Action Dated: September 13, 2006

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

As required by independent claim 1, or by analogous language in independent claim 31.

Furthermore, the references of record do not disclose “an automated process ... designed to inherit [a] second ... automated process for generating said XSLT transform” where the second automated process carries out the various actions specified in claim 1, and “wherein said first ... automated process override[s] a call initiated by said second ... automated process with a call to a portion of said first ... automated process for generating at least one feature of said XSLT transform.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully await Examiner’s determination upon further review of the application in light of his search and analysis of the references. Should any issues arise that can be more efficiently resolved by telephone, Applicant’s representative, Nathaniel Ari Long, can be reached at (206) 332-1385.

Date: December 1, 2006

/Nathaniel Ari Long/
Nathaniel Ari Long
Registration No. 53,233

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439